



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.				
10/590,542	08/25/2006	Mark G. Bock	21654P	9778				
210 MERCK AND CO., INC P O BOX 2000 RAHWAY, NJ 07065-0907	7590 01/05/2009		<table border="1"><tr><td>EXAMINER</td></tr><tr><td>MCDOWELL, BRIANE</td></tr></table>		EXAMINER	MCDOWELL, BRIANE		
EXAMINER								
MCDOWELL, BRIANE								
			<table border="1"><tr><td>ART UNIT</td><td>PAPER NUMBER</td></tr><tr><td>1624</td><td></td></tr></table>	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	1624		
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER							
1624								
			<table border="1"><tr><td>MAIL DATE</td><td>DELIVERY MODE</td></tr><tr><td>01/05/2009</td><td>PAPER</td></tr></table>	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	01/05/2009	PAPER	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE							
01/05/2009	PAPER							

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/590,542

Applicant(s)

BOCK ET AL.

Examiner

BRIAN MCDOWELL

Art Unit

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/55/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/25/2006
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

BEM

DETAILED ACTION

An action on the merits of claims 1-9 is contained herein.

Claim 10 is not considered due to a non-statutory use claim and is withdrawn from consideration. Cancellation of this claim is recommended.

Priority

This application receives the priority date of 3/2/2004, drawn to provisional application 60/549,379.

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it should contain a chemical formula illustrative of applicant's invention (e.g., formula I should be inserted).
Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informality:

At the end of line 17, it currently reads "and (5)". Instead, it should read "and (4)".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 1-9 are objected to because they contain numbers to the left of the claims.

These numbers should be removed from the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 (2nd Paragraph)

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the proviso "that when R⁴ is trifluoromethyl or unsubstituted isoxazolyl, R³ is fluorine". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation since claim 8 encompasses species where R⁴ = unsubstituted isoxazolyl and R³ is not fluorine.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thornton*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-9 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9,12-15,17,20-26 of U.S. Patent No.7,163,951. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because there is significant overlap between the two applications.

The genus structure of '542 may fully encompass the compounds of the instant application. For example in the instant application, when $R^2 = R^3 = R^{1a-1c} = \text{hydrogen}$ and $R^4 = \text{methyl}$, this compound would fall within the genus structure of claim 1 in document '542, thus rendering the compound obvious.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103


The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3,5,6,8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuduk *et al.* (WO 2004/019868)-mentioned in IDS.


The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

Applicant may have the following specie below which may read on the aforementioned claims (with the exception of claim 8):



wherein $R^2 = \text{Cl}$, $R^3 = \text{F}$, $R^4 = \text{isoxazolyl}$, and $\text{CR}^{1a-1c} = \text{trifluoromethyl}$.

Kuduk *et al.* teach the following compound (see page 51, compound 126):



wherein $R^2 = Cl$, $R^3 = Cl$, $R^4 = \text{isoxazolyl}$, and $CR^{1a-1c} = \text{trifluoromethyl}$.

The only difference between applicant's compound and the compound in the Kuduk document is variable R³ (Cl versus F) and R⁴ (3- versus 5-substitution on isoxazole ring).

However in regards to the different substitution pattern on the isoxazole ring, the MPEP 2144.09 states “Compounds which are position isomers (compounds having the same radicals in physically different positions on the same nucleus are generally of sufficiently close structural similarity that there is a presumed expectation that such compounds possess similar properties. In re Wilder, 563 F.2d 457, 195 USPQ 426 (CCPA 1977)).

In reference to substituent R², one would have a reasonable expectation of success in replacing the chlorine with a fluorine atom since they are both halogens (same group in the periodic table) and exhibit similar structural and electronic properties.

Applicant also has a specie in claim 8, wherein $R^2 = Cl$, $R^3 = Cl$, $R^4 =$ isoxazolyl (substituted at 3-position), and $CR^{1a-1c} =$ trifluoromethyl. Again, this compound would be a regioisomer and is considered to be obvious as explained above.

Applicant is advised to take note of any other potential obvious species encompassed in claim 8 from the explanations stated above.

In summary, applicant is taking a well-known compound that is described in the literature and doing a simple modification to the molecule (halogen substitution and altering the manner in which the heterocyclic ring is substituted). Both compounds have the same utility, and it would be expected that based on these simple substitutions that a compound with similar biological activity would have been obtained.

Therefore, the claims are obvious over the prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 (1st Paragraph)

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 2, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for compounds and/or compositions where if R⁴ is C₁₋₆ alkyl, the groups in which said alkyl may be substituted with include halogen, nitro, cyano, and SO₂R^d, does not reasonably provide enablement for the other thousands of compounds that applicant is claiming. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Pursuant to *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731,737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988), one considers the following factors to determine whether undue experimentation is required:

- (A) The breadth of the claims;
- (B) The nature of the invention;
- (C) The state of the prior art;
- (D) The level of one of ordinary skill;
- (E) The level of predictability in the art;
- (F) The amount of direction provided by the inventor;
- (G) The existence of working examples; and
- (H) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

Some experimentation is not fatal; the issue is whether the amount of experimentation is "undue"; see *In re Vaeck*, 20 USPQ2d 1438, 1444. Analysis is described below:

- (A) Breadth of claims: The potential moieties that variable C₁₋₆ alkyl may be substituted with may lead to a myriad of compounds with a wide variety of structures. These compounds encompass molecules that widely vary in the physical and chemical properties such as size, molecular weight, acidity, basicity, and properties that are known in the art to greatly influence pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic parameters, not to mention the ability to productively bind to claimed biological targets. The claims cover compounds easily in the millions given the number of possible rings, ring systems covered by the claims' scope along with varying choices for remaining variables; thus the claims are very broad.
- (B) The nature of the invention: Aminocycloalkanecarboxamide derivatives that may act as Bradykinin antagonists or inverse agonists.

(C) State of the Prior Art: Chemistry is unpredictable. See In Re Marzocchi and Horton 169 USPQ at 367 paragraph 3:

"Most non-chemists would probably be horrified if they were to learn how many attempted syntheses fail, and how inefficient research chemists are. The ratio of successful to unsuccessful chemical experiments in a normal research laboratory is far below unity, and synthetic research chemists, in the same way as most scientists, spend most of their time working out what went wrong, and why. Despite the many pitfalls lurking in organic synthesis, most organic chemistry textbooks and research articles do give the impression that organic reactions just proceed smoothly and that the total synthesis of complex natural products, for instance, is maybe a labor-intensive but otherwise undemanding task.

In fact, most syntheses of structurally complex natural products are the result of several years of hard work by a team of chemists, with almost every step requiring careful optimization. The final synthesis usually looks quite different from that originally planned, because of unexpected difficulties encountered in the initially chosen synthetic sequence. Only the seasoned practitioner who has experienced for himself the many failures and frustrations which the development (sometimes even the repetition) of a synthesis usually implies will be able to appraise such workChemists tend not to publish negative results, because these are, as opposed to positive results, never definite (and far too copious)" Dorwald F. A. *Side Reactions in Organic Synthesis*, 2005, Wiley: VCH, Weinheim pg. IX of Preface.

(D) Skill of those in the art: The level of skill in the art is high.

(E) Level of predictability in the art: It is well established that "the scope of enablement varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved," and physiological activity is generally considered to be an unpredictable factor. See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

(F) Direction or Guidance: Little guidance or direction is provided by applicant in reference to making compounds other than if R^4 is C_{1-6} alkyl, the groups in which said alkyl may be substituted with include halogen, nitro, cyano, and SO_2R^d . The presence of various bulky heterocyclic or carbocyclic rings attached to the alkyl group may be chemically incompatible with the method of use embraced in the instant claims. Specification offers no teachings or suggestion as to how to make and use these compounds. Also, note MPEP 2164.08(b) which states that claims that read on "... significant numbers of inoperative embodiments would render claims nonenabled when the specification does not clearly identify the operative embodiments and undue experimentation is involved in determining those that are operative.";

(G) Working Examples: The compound core depicted with specific substituents represent a narrow subgenus for which applicant has provided sufficient guidance to make and use; however, this disclosure is not sufficient to allow extrapolation of the limited examples to enable the scope of the compounds instantly claimed. Applicant has provided no working examples of any compounds where the compound of formula (1) did not contain the variables previously mentioned above in the present application.

The specification gives some *in vitro* test results on Bradykinin inhibitory effects of a limited number of preferable compounds, however it is too homogeneous to provide a clear evaluation of which moieties attached to the alkyl group out of the many claimed might affect potency to a large or small degree. The pharmaceutical art is unpredictable and target compounds need to be individually assessed for viability. Extremely broad generalizations as found in the instant claims are in contradiction with the basis of quantitative structure-activity-relationship (QSAR).

Within the specification, "specific operative embodiments or examples of the invention must be set forth. Examples and description should be of sufficient scope as to justify the scope of the claims. *Markush* claims must be provided with support in the disclosure for each member of the *Markush* group. Where the constitution and formula of a chemical compound is stated only as a probability or speculation, the disclosure is not sufficient to support claims identifying the compound by such composition or formula." See MPEP 608.01(p).

(H) The quantity of experimentation needed: Since there are very limited working examples as described above, the amount of experimentation is expected to be high and burdensome. Applicant fails to provide guidance and supporting information for how to make and/or use the thousands of other compounds which are encompassed by the claims, therefore undue experimentation would be expected.

Due to the level of unpredictability in the art, the very limited guidance provided, and the lack of working examples, the applicant has shown lack of enablement. MPEP

2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRIAN MCDOWELL whose telephone number is (571)270-5755. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. James O. Wilson can be reached 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BM

**/James O. Wilson/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1624**